

### REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated February 25, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-28 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-28 are rejected by the February 25, 2005 Office Action.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-26 and 28 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,684,240 issued to Goddard (hereinafter referred to as Goddard). The MPEP at §2131 states that a "claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states that Goddard discloses setting lock levels based on content and further discloses dynamically filtering the content of a multimedia program in real time on a segment-by-segment basis responsive to a filter criteria. The Examiner's position is that Goddard teaches the subject matter for extracting audio, video, and transcript features from segments is met by Central Processing System 602 of Information Appliance or Set-top box as discussed in col. 3, lines 28-55, col. 5, lines 14-33 and col. 12, lines 25-45. The Applicants, respectfully point out that Goddard teaches the setting of acceptable content ratings based upon filtering content of rating enabled media. Goddard does not disclose or suggest the subject matter for extracting audio, video, and transcript features from segments of the multimedia program.

The Examiner further states that Goddard teaches generating rating levels or parameters "a numeric ranking for the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes "filter criteria" for each of the content of segment at col. 4, lines 1-11 and col. 9, line 57-col. 10, line 29. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that col. 4, lines 1-11 of Goddard simply mentions that content ratings and parental lock to prevent access of inappropriate content. Goddard at col. 9, line 57-col. 10, line 29 discusses different user profiles and varying levels of rating parameters that can be used. There is no disclosure

or suggestion for generating a numeric ranking for the filter criteria for content of each of the segments. The Applicants, respectfully, assert that there is no analysis that is done on a segment by segment basis by Goddard. The only analysis performed by Goddard is performed on the ratings that are already given for content. The Applicants, respectfully, assert that there is no analysis that is done on a segment by segment basis by Goddard.

The Examiner contends that Goddard teaches that when the respective rating level for the content of segments exceeds a threshold, processing that segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the filter criteria. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that the filter criteria of Goddard is the already existing ratings. Goddard does not extract features and generate a ranking for filter criteria. Goddard employs existing rankings and ratings.

It appears from the rejection contained in the Office Action that the Examiner is reading the use and ranking of rating levels as taught by Goddard so broadly to encompass the extraction of features as defined by the rejected claims. Therefore, in order to clearly distinguish the subject matter defined by Claim 1 from the teachings of Goddard, the foregoing amendment to the claims has amended Claim 1 to define subject matter for splitting the multimedia program into a plurality of multimedia components and extracting audio, video, and transcript features from segments within the multimedia components. This subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by the teachings of Goddard.

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria, corresponds to language included in the segment being processed and the audio portion of the segment is modified during the processing step. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 3, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria corresponds to an image included in the segment being processed and the video portion of the segment is modified during the processing step. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 4, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria corresponds to an image included in the segment being processed and the

video portion of the segment is skipped during the processing step. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 5, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the rating level or parameters is weighted rating levels or ranking. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 6, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where each weighted factor employed in generating the weighted rating levels identifies a characteristic of a respective viewer of the media program. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 7, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the rating level for each segment is generated by comparing the content of each segment to the filter criteria. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 8, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where rating levels for proximate ones of the segments each exceed the threshold, merging the proximate ones of the segments and any intervening segments to thereby produce a merged segment and processing the merged segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the filter criteria. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claims 9-11, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses different "first and second" filter criteria and generating different rating levels for respective different filter criteria for each segments and when the respective rating level "first" and "second numeric ranking" for that segment exceeds a first threshold, processing that segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to one of the filter criteria or the first or second filter criteria where the different filter criteria is associated with passive users and comprises a different set of filter criteria where one is a subset of the other set. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claims 12-14, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where a parent provides training segments having content corresponding to the filter criteria; and learning to identify content matching the filter criteria, note that the authorized user or parent the first time the user blocks example, content, the acceptable content rating parameters for the AI or STB 200 will be set to the content rating of the content and as the user selects additional example content are adjusted or fine tuned to desired level of filtering. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 15, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the filter criteria are freely selectable from different predefined filter criteria. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 1.

Regarding Claim 16, the Examiner states that Goddard discloses the subject matter for "a visual analysis module extracting features..." and "an audio analysis module extracting audible features" is met by Central Processing System 602 of Information Appliance or Set-top box as discussed in col. 3, lines 28-55, col. 5, lines 14-33 and col. 12, lines 25-45. The Applicants, respectfully point out that Goddard does not disclose or suggest the extracting of audible features and text from segments, extracting video features or extracting second audible features from a sequence of segments in a multimedia program. Goddard only teaches the use of content ratings already provided that are based upon filtering content of rating enabled media. Goddard does not disclose or suggest the subject matter for extracting audio, video, and transcript features from segments of the multimedia program.

The Examiner further states that the IA or STB of Goddard can dynamically adjust content rating parameters. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that adjusting content rating parameters is not equivalent to extracting audio and video features from the segments of the multimedia program.

The Examiner states that Goddard teaches an analyzer which generates rating levels or parameters "a numeric ranking for the violence or sexual themes or rating parameters or schemes "filter criteria" for each of the content of segment at col. 4, lines 1-11. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that col. 4, lines 1-11 of Goddard simply

mentions that content ratings and parental lock to prevent access of inappropriate content. The Examiner further states that Goddard at col. 7, line 42-col. 8, line 5, and lines 17-22 discusses a numeric rating for violence or sexual themes. The Applicants, respectfully points out that Goddard teaches that different user profiles and varying levels of rating parameters that can be used. There is no disclosure or suggestion for generating a numeric ranking for each of the segments in the multimedia program content of each of the segments.

The Applicants, respectfully, assert that the only analysis performed by Goddard is performed on the ratings that are already given for content. The Applicants, respectfully, assert that there is no analysis that is done on a segment by segment basis by Goddard. The Examiner contends that Goddard teaches that when the respective rating level for the content of segments exceeds a threshold, processing that segment to thereby eliminate material corresponding to the filter criteria. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that the filter criteria of Goddard is the already existing ratings. Goddard does not extract features and generate a ranking for filter criteria. Goddard employs existing rankings and ratings.

It appears from the rejection contained in the Office Action that the Examiner is reading the use and ranking of rating levels as taught by Goddard so broadly to encompass the extraction of features as defined by the rejected claims. Therefore, in order to clearly distinguish the subject matter defined by Claim 16 from the teachings of Goddard, the foregoing amendment to the claims has amended Claim 16 to define subject matter for a splitting mechanism that splits the multimedia program into a plurality of multimedia components. The transcript analysis module extracts first audible features from a transcript analysis component within the multimedia components, the visual analysis module extracts video features from a visual analysis component within the multimedia components, the audio analysis module extracts second audible features from an audio analysis component within the multimedia components; and the analyzer generates a numeric ranking for each of the segments in response to extracted features. This subject matter is supported by the specification to the present application on page 13, beginning at line 18. The foregoing discussed subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by the teachings of Goddard.

Regarding Claim 17, the Examiner states that Goddard further discloses where the

filter modified different content of the respective segments. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

Regarding Claim 18, the Examiner states that Goddard teaches the subject matter defined by Claim 18 as previously discussed with respect to Claim 3. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

Regarding Claim 19, the Examiner states that Goddard teaches the subject matter defined by Claim 19 as previously discussed with respect to Claim 4. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

Regarding Claims 20-21, the Examiner states that Goddard teaches the subject matter defined by Claims 20-21 as previously discussed with respect to Claims 5-6. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

Regarding Claims 22-24, the Examiner states that Goddard teaches the subject matter defined by Claims 22-24 as previously discussed with respect to Claims 12-14. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.


Regarding Claims 25-26 and 28, the Examiner states that Goddard teaches the subject matter for a television set, STB and client software device incorporates the parental control system as defined by Claims 25-26 and 28. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

The Office Action rejects Claim 27 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard, as applied to Claim 16 above, and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,829,582 issued to Barsness (hereinafter referred to as Barsness). The Examiner states that Barsness discloses controlled access to audio signals based on objectionable audio content detected via sound recognition, which includes a television reception where the audio/video signals is receive from PVR. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that this rejection is moot in view of the above discussed amendment to Claim 16.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach  
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:  
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA  
Tel No. (914) 333-9643

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being transmitted on this date via  
facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:  
Mail Stop: Amendment  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: May 25, 2005

(Signature)

By:

  
James D. Leimbach